Rt. 8, Frederick, Md. 21701
7/4/75

Ms. Sylvia Cordy
AM Washington
WMAL-TV
4461 Connecticut Ave., NW
Washington, D.C. 20008

Dear Ms. Cordy,

Herewith the copy of WHITEWASH IV: TOP-SECRET JFK ASSASSINATION TRANSCRIPT you ordered in our yesterday's conversation. As the enclosed list of my books shows, it is $6.25 by mail.

I think you are entitled to an explanation of what I said and why I said it. Only to a very limited degree are they personal. If you changed your mind about having me on your program you'd have saved me time and trouble by leaving a message for me at the number my wife told you would reach me or by calling her back as soon as you decided you did not want me. When you did not do this and then did not return my call promptly but made me wait more than an hour you did what you had no way of knowing would result: made impossible a conference with three men who had travelled all the way here for an uninterruoted conference that now will have to be held at a later date.

From my never having approached your show you have to know that I do not seek personal publicity. The one factor that cannot figure in what I said is this.

What you did exactly duplicates what the network did on the second of two very bad shows by Geraldo Rivera. It called me to ask if I d be willing to go to New York for the second and at the very same time told me it would not ask me because it has given the allocation of the time on that side to another to control. I believe as I then wrote the net that this was an abdication of its obligations. Aside from this it was a gratuitous personal insult. And to make the whole thing more unconscionable it then gave my letter of protest to an unscrupulous commercializer and government-hater it aired so that he could misuse it to defame me behind my back by misrepresenting it.

If I am entirely alone in having devoted full-time to this subject from the beginning and entirely alone in representing a minority view that I regard as the only honest and responsible one on this controversial subject, I have invoked the Fairness Doctrine only very infrequently. When I did with your station some years ago it actually referred me to the net, which is not what the FCC says. I carried it no farthur. That was on the King assassination.

I know that those who produce TV shows have many problems and have to cover all issues and questions. However, their real problems do not in any way diminish their responsibilities. It does not in any way mean that they must become the creatures of public-relations artists. In airing questions of substantial national interest common decency and concern for substance do require serious effort in seeking out all responsible views. In your coming show you will air none, in my opinion.

Since we spoke yesterday I have thought of this more because it typifies to me, from long and not pleasant experience, what is so wrong with the country and why it goes unrectified. The mass media has failed in its obligations. If there are explanations readily available, the explanations do not alter the fact.

We have a representative society. It can function only when the people are fully and honestly and accurately informed.

There are many ways in which those who put on a show can determine who is expert without dependance on flacks and flackery. One is from the standard publishing directories. Another is from consultation with real experts in the field. You could not have consulted the first or the second or you'd not have done as you did. Another is from consultation with existing legal records. Obviously you did not consider this and may have regarded it, if you thought of it, as troubhesome or burdensome.

Asx a result the people will again be given personal promotions and propaganda instead of fact on an important national issue.

Had this not been the undeviating record of the major media for the past decade all of xxx history might have been different.

This, not personal feelings or questions, is what account for the pointedness of what I said yesterday or what I say now.

Thus I am not making a request for Fairness Doctrine time of you.

Nor would I accept an invitation unless as a res ult I were to receive from it what these two you are airing are getting. One has a book currently behing heavily promoted by those who commercial female pubic hair. The other has an old and outdated book about to appear in reprint, abook, prenthetically, with a false and evil doctrine. One dated when it appeared where it is not otherwise flawed.

Your audience can obtain these books by simply going to bookstores. They can obtain mine only from me, by mail.

You need not agree with me or those to whom I refer you, but in engaging in a promotion for the so-called Psychological Stress Evaluator, which is what you will be doing, you will also be promoting a police-state device. Ask the ACLU.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg